

REMARKS

Favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-26 are currently active in this case.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14, 16, and 18-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Murai* (U.S. Patent No. 4,962,421) and *Takahashi* (Japanese Patent No. JP 09-252413) in view of *Ikemoto et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,902,053, hereinafter *Ikemoto*); Claims 5, 7, 13, 15, and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable under 37 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Murai*, *Takahashi*, and *Ikemoto* in further view of *Kanamori et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,504,821, hereinafter *Kanamori*); Claim 17 was rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Murai*, *Takahashi*, and *Ikemoto* in further view of *Tsuboi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,958,221, hereinafter *Tsuboi*); Claims 22-24 were rejected as being unpatentable under 37 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Murai* in view of *Tsuboi*; and Claims 25-26 were rejected as being unpatentable under 37 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Murai* and *Tsuboi* and in view of *Takahashi*.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Murai* and *Takahashi* in view of *Ikemoto*. Claim 1 recites:

1. A printer, comprising:
an image processing means for,
storing a plurality of gamma data in an updateable table,
each of the plurality of gamma data being different from each
other in a value on which a color appearance characteristic of a
printing media depends, and

converting an image composed of R, G, and B signals to a set of Y, M, and C complementary-color images, each image being converted using one of the plurality of gamma data;

means for selecting a best of the set of Y, M, and C complementary color images; and

means for adjusting a printing process of the printer with the gamma data used to convert the selected best Y, M, and C complementary color image.

However, the combined references fail to teach or suggest similar subject matter.

Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion in the outstanding Official Action that indicates *Takahashi* teaches “storing a gamma data in an amendment or updateable table (paragraph 27-31 of *Takahashi*)”. Applicant respectfully notes that the amendment table of *Takahashi* does not appear to store gamma data as recited in Claim 1. The gamma data of Claim 1 is stored in a table and each gamma data is utilized to convert one image (“plurality of gamma data being different from each other in a value on which a clear appearance characteristic of a printing media depends,” and “each image being converted using one of the plurality of gamma data”). However, *Takahashi* does not discuss a gamma table. Instead, *Takahashi* provides a gamma amendment table as such, it appears that the table in *Takahashi* is used to change gamma values as opposed to being a gamma data for a specific image.

Furthermore, in describing the use of the gamma amendment table, *Takahashi* explains that entire gamma amendment tables are applied to a particular image (e.g., paragraph 0033, “actually giving gamma amendment on two or more gamma amendment tables to this image data in a computer 200,” and “selected gamma amendment table is transmitted to the color processor 100”). Therefore, since the gamma amendment tables apply to an entire image, it cannot be the

same type of gamma data nor stored in the same type of updateable table as claimed in Claim 1, because Claim 1 specifically recites that "each image being converted using one of the plurality of gamma data", therefore, only one gamma data of the plurality stored in the table is used on any one particular image.

Applicants also respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 18 based on the combination of *Murai* and *Takahashi* in view of *Ikemoto*. Applicants agree that *Murai* teaches printing a set of YMC complimentary color images in a test pattern consisting of a number of columns and rows to allow a user to easily obtain or best select one of the test image pattern. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion that based on this teaching of *Murai* it would be apparent to one of skill in the art that this teaching meets the recitation of Claim 1 of "a set of markers." Applicants' disclosure provides a detailed description of outputting a set of markers for selection of a test pattern from a set of previously printed test patterns. The set of markers as recited in Claim 18 provides a significant advance over that shown in *Murai* or the other cited references. The use of a set of markers provides a graphical way for a test image to be selected. The set of markers allows a separation between the printed images and the selection of the printed image. Thus, the set of markers provides an advantage over other display systems that might display the individual test images (or parts thereof) from which a user would make a selection.

Accordingly, since none of the cited references teach or suggest outputting a set of markers, each marker respectively corresponding to one of the test pattern images, and means for identifying one of the markers corresponding to a best one of the test pattern images, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 18 is patentable over the cited references.

Claim 22 presents a method that also includes limitations of outputting a set of markers, each marker corresponding to one of the printed test images and

retrieving the user selection of one of the markers. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 22 contains subject matter that is also neither taught nor suggested by the cited art references. Accordingly, Claim 22 is respectfully submitted as being patentable over the cited references.

Based on the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 22, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 2-21 and 23-26 are also patentable.

Consequently, no further issues are believed to be outstanding, and it is respectfully submitted that this case is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Reed Smith Crosby Heafey LLP
A Professional Corporation

Dated: _____

9/19/2003

By: _____

Name: John W. Carpenter
Registration No. 39,129
Attorney for Applicant

Two Embarcadero Center
Suite 2000
PO Box 7936
San Francisco, CA 94120-7936
Direct Dial (415) 659-5927
(415) 543-8700 Telephone
(415) 391-8269 Facsimile